5291 RF 93

DUE 1-5-94

DIST. BENEDETTI, R.L BENJAMIN, A.

BERMAN, H.S. CARNIVAL, G.J

COPP. R.D. CORDOVA, R.C

DAVIS, J.G. FERRERA, D.W FRANZ, W.A. HANNI, B.J.

HEALY, T.J.

HEDAHL, T.G. HILBIG, J.G.

KIRBY, W.A. KUESTER, A.W. MAHAFFEY, J.W

MANN, H.P.

MARX, G.E

McKENNA, F.G MORGAN, R.V.

PIZZUTO, V.M.

SCHUBERT, A.L.

SETLOCK, G.H. SULLIVAN, M.T

SWANSON, E.R

WILKINSON, R.B WILSON, J.M.

POTTER, G.L. SANDLIN, N.B. SATTERWHITE, D.G

HUTCHINS, N.M.

emorandum

Department of Energy

DEC 16 8 18 Rocky Flats Office

EGS C ROCKY FLATS PLANT CORRESPOYE THAT ADDITION

DEC 1 5 1993

ERD:PS:13981

Building 788 Removal



Ned Hutchins, Acting Associate General Manager Environmental Restoration Management EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc.

Building 788, Cementation Process Building, will be removed to allow environmental restoration work in Operable Unit 4. This building is a steel frame Butler type building, 225 feet long and 20 feet wide. This facility was built in 1985 for a cost of about \$1 M. It is a building whose design allows use for storage, warehousing, and light industrial activities.

Concensus opinons from several meetings is that building 788 should be relocated to an area not impacted by Inter-Agency Agreement constraints. In order to make a decision as to whether this is economically practical, a response is ultimately needed to the following questions:

- Has Building 788 gone through a Master Site Plan process analysis?
- What alternatives have been considered to reuse of 788?
- What are the pros/cons and cost for each alternative?
- What are the results of a cost/benefit analysis of each alternative?

To respond to the above, two preliminary actions are required. First, EG&G is requested to perform a Hazard Assessment of the building to identify all potential hazards. Secondly a Baseline Survey needs to be developed in order to understand what the levels of contamination are to determine what cleanup needs to be performed in order to move the building. This should be expedited as an early activity in the Building 788 removal planning.

To do the economic analysis assume that the building needs to meet the Free Release Criteria in HSP 1810 i.e. 300dpm. Depending on the levels of contamination and the decontamination effort required, it may well be that it will be impractical to attempt to move it. If this is the case, then we need to continue to pursue the idea of cutting it up and using it for part of the fill in closing the Solar Ponds.

The scope and funding for Phase I activities for Building 788 relocation were approved as part of BCP-ER-013-94 on December 10, 1993. While these concerns are generally addressed under this plan, I would request that you indicate specifically how the above items would be addressed in the planning process.

CORRES CONTROL	х	,	
PATS/T130G	X		
ADMN RECORD/080	7		

Reviewed for Addressee Corres, Control RFP

12-16-93	(, .	
12 10 12		
DATE	BY	

Ref Ltr. #

DOE ORDER # 5400. /

RF-46522 (Rev. 9/93)

DEC 1 5 1993

N. Hutchins ERD:PS:13981

2

A response is requested within three weeks of the date of this letter. Questions can be addressed to Vern Witherill at extension 7003.

Vern F. Witherill
Acting Director
Decontamination and Decommissioning